

Remarks

Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, 10-20, 22, 23, and 25-37 were pending in the present application prior to the present Request for Continued Examination and Amendment. Claims 5, 7, 31, and 32 have been canceled herein. Claims 1-3, 8, 10-20, 22, 23, 25-30 and 33-37 are therefore currently pending in the present application.

No new matter has been added to this application by the amendments made herein, with support being found in the specification, claims and figures as filed. In view of this, the Applicant respectfully requests entry of this Request for Continued Examination and Amendment and consideration of the present application in view of the Applicant's comments below.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, 10-20, 22, 23, 25, and 33-37

Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, 10-20, 22, 23, 25, and 33-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,640,565 to Dickinson in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,983,322 to Tripp, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,058,626 to Pan. The Dickinson reference, as noted by the Examiner, discloses a business card system for use in a network environment. The newly cited Pan reference discloses a method for translating internet search inquiries from a first language into a second language in order to search web pages which are in the second language.

The present system comprises a plurality of servers having databases on which users' contact information is stored. Such databases are searched simultaneously by a user, even when the search inquiry is placed in a language different from the language in which the contact information on a particular server is stored. Such simultaneous searching is different from that described in the Pan reference, in which a search inquiry is translated into a single language and then sent to a single search engine that operates in this language.

The Tripp patent is cited as disclosing a search design that “permits for simultaneous searches” in order to supply the foregoing deficiency in the Pan and Dickinson references. In particular, the abstract section of that patent, as well as claim 11, are cited as supporting the present rejection under § 103(a). The Tripp system, however, is described in the abstract as follows:

“The database is divided into segments based on content and distributed over a multiplicity of servers. Updates and **queries are data driven and determine the segment and server to which they must be directed avoiding broadcasting.**”
(Abstract, emphasis added)

Thus, as illustrated in Figure 2, the Tripp system segments data on different servers and directs search inquiries to the specific segment to which each query should be directed, rather than sending search inquiries simultaneously to a plurality of databases. The Tripp system therefore teaches away from performing simultaneous searches of multiple databases as recited in the presently claimed system and method.

Claim 11 of the Tripp patent, which recites a system “where updates and queries can occur simultaneously” is also cited in support of the present obviousness rejection. The simultaneous occurrence of an update and a search, however, does not suggest the simultaneous search of multiple databases distributed over a plurality of servers, as recited in the present system and method.

The Dickinson reference likewise teaches away from the simultaneous search of multiple databases:

“This design provides many advantages. First, simpler modification of business card information is permitted while browsing functionality is accomplished **without excessive broadcast behavior.**” (Specification, column 8, lines 28-31, emphasis added)

By contrast, the present system and method provide for the simultaneous searching of multiple databases distributed over a plurality of servers, in different

languages. The present system and method thus serve the needs of individuals who may express their names and contact information in different languages (e.g., English, Chinese characters, Japanese hiragana), and who store their contact information in disparate locations. Such a system is not suggested by the prior art of record.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully submits that the Tripp patent does not support the rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, 10-20, 22, 23, 25, and 33-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and therefore that no prima facie showing of obviousness has been made. The Dickinson reference, moreover, likewise teaches away from the simultaneous searching of multiple databases. In view of this, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, 10-20, 22, 23, 25, and 33-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 26-32

Claims 26-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,640,565 to Dickinson in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,058,626 to Pan. Independent claim 26 has been amended to recite the step of simultaneously transmitting a search inquiry to a plurality of servers. As stated above, both the Dickinson reference and the other cited art of reference teach away from such a step.

Claims 27-32 depend from claim 26, and are therefore patentable for the foregoing reason. In view of this, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 26-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Conclusion

The Applicant believes that all pending claims are in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is thus respectfully requested. If, however, there remain any issues which can be addressed by telephone, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any fees due in connection with this Request for Continued Examination and Amendment, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-2090.

Respectfully submitted,

SHELDON MAK ROSE & ANDERSON

Date: September 12, 2008

By: /michael fedrick/
Michael Fedrick
Reg. No. 36,799

100 Corson Street, Third Floor
Pasadena, California 91103-3842
(626) 796-4000
Customer No. 23676